

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this response no claims have been amended, cancelled or added.

Each issue raised in the Office Action is addressed hereinafter. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claims 1-54 are overcome for reasons set forth hereafter.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, Claim 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,953,506 by Kalra et al. (hereafter "Kalra") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,622,171 by Gupta et al. (hereafter "Gupta").

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

CLAIMS 1, 19, 37

In the Office Action, it is stated that independent Claims 1, 19 and 37 are unpatentable over *Kalra* in view of *Gupta*. It is respectfully submitted that *Kalra* and *Gupta*, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the novel features of independent Claims 1, 19, and 37 for at least the following reasons.

Both *Kalra* and *Gupta* involve a delivery system for encoding, transmitting, and decoding multimedia content. In other words, the technology of *Kalra* and *Gupta* is completely different from the technology of Claims 1, 19 and 37. To explain, the technology in *Kalra* and *Gupta* involves "creating digital signals that allow images and sounds to be recorded, stored, transmitted and played back." The streaming of recorded images and sounds is completely different from

streaming software code because the streamed signals of recorded images and sounds are merely decoded for replay at the client device. In the case of decoding sounds and images for replay at the client device, there is no requirement for the client device to be fooled into thinking that the entire file is resident on the client device. Such is not the case for executing software at the client device. Streaming software code ("streamed application file pages") involves executing instructions of the software application code at the client device without having the entire software application code resident on the client device. The client device is able to run the software program as if the entire software program is available on the client device.

It is noteworthy that the cited prior art involve the streaming of images and sounds for replay at the client device rather than executing software programs at the client device as if the entire software program is available on the client device. The execution of instructions of the streamed software application code at the client device without having the entire software application code resident on the client device is, in part, made possible by the novel feature of streaming application file pages to the client.

Claims 2-18, 20-36, and 38-54 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, on Claims 1, 19, and 37, respectively and include all the features of their respective independent claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-18, 20-36, and 38-54 are allowable for at least the reasons provided herein with respect to Claims 1, 19, and 37. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-18, 20-36, and 38-54 recite additional features that independently render Claims 2-18, 20-36, and 38-54 patentable over the cited

art.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4305.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP



William F. Ahmann
Registration No. 52,548

Date: August 31, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P. O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
(650) 838-4300